

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 2, 2005. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 12, and 13 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The Examiner has questioned the use of the term “not” when referring to the fact that the product code has no routing information contained therein. Further, it is stated that the purpose of the product code is not to route anything to another location. Therefore, this clearly provides a limitation to the claim in that, if the product code contains routing information, then such system would not be covered by the claims. As such, Applicant believes that this particular application does not fall within the examples set forth in MPEP §2173.05(d). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. Section 112 rejection with respect to claims 1, 12, and 13.

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable under *Hudetz* in view of *Call* and further in view of *Tracy et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The *Hudetz* and *Call* references have previously been described. Each of these, as noted in previous Responses lacks the ability to allow control of a display of a user location wherein a machine readable code has been input. The *Tracy et al.* reference is a reference that is directed towards the use of a portable terminal that is operable to scan information and then send a “request” to a central server for information with respect thereto. In the operation of this system, there is provided the ability to scan an item and then this goes as a request to a central system wherein information will be returned based upon various preferences and the such. One item that can be returned is a link. However, this is very similar to *Hudetz* in that someone has to select this link to actually jump to a particular location. This is set forth, for example, at column 11, beginning at line 29 and extending to line 40 as follows:

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

S/N 09/382,375

Atty. Dkt. No. PHL-24,745

In FIG 7E, an example is provided of a consumer using the cholesterol preference. The consumer has scanned an item of broccoli, a no cholesterol item. The scanned item is displayed with a friendly message and a happy face which in this case acts as a “link”: to a consumer’s advocate home web page available on the Internet which provides various data and recommendations on how to prepare broccoli and other healthy foods. The selection of this link, in the illustrated example, would download a text-only version of the web page. In the event a larger display was used, such as that shown in FIG. 2, the graphics version of the page would be displayed.

It can be seen that this is not a controlled operation. As such, Applicant believes that this selection does not meet the limitations of the claim. In column 12, beginning at line 54, it is set forth that a coupon system may be provided for a scanned item. The specific language states that “the controller generates a ‘link’ for the scanned item, identifying the nature, availability, conditions, locations and the amount of savings generated by the coupon..” (column 12, lines 63-65). Again, this language indicates that a selection is required. In column 13, beginning at line 12, the system is set forth as creating a linked page for scanned items including any associated information matching a customer’s preference profile. All that is generated is a hyperlink to a page of coupon data. This portion of the specification is set out as follows:

In order to provide coupon functions, the central host is provided with a database of available electronic coupons and hard coupons. In a preferred embodiment, the system automatically creates a linked page for scanned items including any associated information matching a customer’s preference profile. The system will employ a dynamic page builder using a predetermined coupon template wherein a hyperlink to a page of coupon data is presented. In the event that the page exceeds the display limitations of the display (i.e. requires more lines than are available on a single display for the terminal in use, the page builder automatically creates a new “next page” link to be displayed on the terminal. The dynamic page builder program also permits an override function in the event a link is provided to an external web page address. Using the IP address of the portable terminal, the central host will retrieve the file from a remote site (i.e., and Internet server) and retransmit the web page to the portable terminal. The retransmission by the central host will include any reformatting constraints which are applicable to the destination portable terminal which may only have a partial view screen capability. The resulting collection of data may then be transmitted to the in-store system by E-mail transmission or through a data collection article such as a smart-card or a floppy disk. Store receivers (i.e. kiosks) would be installed to load such data on to the customer’s data file.

Further, this portion in column 13 is directed more toward the concept of assembling information

#### **AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

S/N 09/382,375

Atty. Dkt. No. PHL-24,745

and transferring that information to the user as opposed to merely linking the customer to some item.

As such, the *Tracy et al.* reference does not provide the clear, automatic “jumping” to a link on the network which is controlled by the creator of the database. Rather, the *Tracy* reference merely provides a central host that can access a particular terminal and send information thereto. Thus, it is the CPU that generates the information that is transmitted to a particular user, as opposed to controlling that terminal to allow that terminal to “jump” to a location. Thus, Applicant believes that the *Tracy* reference does not cure the deficiencies noted in prior responses with respect to *Hudetz* and *Call*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of 35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejection with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-17.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-24,745 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant

/gmh/  
Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30,646

GMH:jlh:dd

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
February 28, 2006

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**  
S/N 09/382,375  
Atty. Dkt. No. PHL Y-24,745